



AF:  
Ifw

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of: **Yasuhito TAIRA**

Group Art Unit: **2176**

Serial No.: **09/704,558**

Examiner: **James H. Blackwell**

Filed: **November 3, 2000**

Confirmation Number: **4557**

For: **PROCESSOR WITH SEPARATELY CONFIGURED DISPLAY CONTROL FILE,  
CGI SCRIPTS, AND PROCESSING PROGRAM (AS AMENDED)**

Attorney Docket Number: **001475**

Customer Number: **38834**

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL OFFICE ACTION**

Box: AF (After Final)

Commissioner for Patents

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

November 2, 2005

Sir:

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action mailed August 3, 2005.

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over DuFresne, U.S. Patent No. 5,835,712, in view of Spence et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,185,600. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for two reasons.

First, claim 5 describes a "processor" having an "interpreter" that:

analyzes a description of a display control file, which is designated by the Web browser, describing therein display control information for a Web page that is displayed on the operation terminal.

Claims 6-8 depend from claim 5, so they also describe this subject matter. Accordingly, to justify the rejection, the PTO must show how the asserted prior art either teaches or suggests this subject matter.